

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action, Examiner Geib rejected pending claims 1-10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,956,518 to *DeHon* et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,915,123 to *Mirsky* et al. The Applicant has thoroughly considered Examiner Geib's remarks concerning the patentability of claims 1-10 over *DeHon* in view of *Mirsky*. The Applicant has also thoroughly read *DeHon* in view of *Mirsky*. To warrant this §103(a) rejection of claims 1-10, *DeHon* and *Mirsky* in combination must teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent claims 1 and 9. See, MPEP §2143. The Applicant respectfully traverses this §103(a) rejection of independent claims 1 and 9, because *DeHon* and *Mirsky* in combination fail to teach or suggest the following limitations of independent claims 1 and 9:

1. “issuing means for configuring the plurality of processing elements by issuing a program-counter-driven instruction flow to the plurality of processing elements”, and “the processing elements from the plurality of processing elements are similar to each other, each processing element from the plurality of processing elements being capable of executing each instruction from the plurality of instructions as issued by the issuing means” as recited in independent claim 1; and
2. “issuing means for configuring the plurality of processing elements by issuing a program-counter-driven instruction flow to the plurality of processing elements”, and “designing the processing elements from the plurality of processing elements to be similar to each other, and each processing element from the plurality of processing elements to be capable of executing each instruction from the plurality of instructions as issued by the issuing means” as recited in independent claim 9.

DeHon. As best shown in FIG. 6, a careful review of *DeHon* reveals the fact that *DeHon* teaches the use of a selection signal as an issuing means for configuring a plurality of basic functional units BFU 100. Specifically, *DeHon* teaches a storage of configuration words in a configuration memory 105 whereby a use of a globally broadcast 2-bit global context selecting signal enables a selection of a configuration work address ADR via a network port A 122. See, DeHon at column 6, lines 19-26.

Thus, *DeHon* clearly fails to teach or suggest an issuing means for configuring basic functional units BFU 100 by issuing a program-counter-driven instruction flow to basic functional units BFU 100 as encompassed by independent claims 1 and 9. As such, *DeHon* clearly fails to teach or suggest a design and incorporation of each basic functional unit BFU 100 to be capable of executing each instruction from the plurality of instructions issued by the issuing means as required by independent claims 1 and 9.

Mirsky. As best shown in FIG. 7, a careful review of *Mirsky* reveals the fact that *Mirsky* teaches the configuration network source 1004 and a configuration network interface 1006 as an issuing means for configuring a plurality of multiple context processing elements MCPE 1002. Specifically, *Mirsky* teaches a broadcast of configuration data, address mask data and destination identification data by units 1004 and 1006 to multiple context processing elements MCPE 1002 whereby such data is used to configure multiple context processing elements MCPE 1002. See, Mirsky at column 6, line 64 to column 8, line 52.

Thus, *Mirsky* clearly fails to teach or suggest an issuing means for configuring multiple context processing elements MCPE 1002 by units 1004 and 1006 issuing a program-counter-driven instruction flow to multiple context processing elements MCPE 1002 as encompassed by independent claims 1 and 9. As such, *Mirsky* clearly fails to teach or suggest a design and incorporation of each multiple context processing elements MCPE 1002 to be capable of executing each instruction from the plurality of instructions issued by the issuing means as required by independent claims 1 and 9.

DeHon and Mirsky in Combination. At best, a combination of *DeHon* and *Mirsky* would incorporate units 104 and 106 of *Mirsky* as a means for broadcasting configuration data, address mask data and destination identification data to basic functional units BFU 100 of *DeHon* as modified in view of *Mirsky* to process the configuration data, address mask data and destination identification data. Unequivocally, this combination of *DeHon* and *Mirsky* fails to teach or suggest the aforementioned limitations of independent claims 1 and 9. Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claims 1 and 9 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *DeHon* in view of *Mirsky* is therefore respectfully requested.

Claims 2-8 depend from independent claim 1. Therefore, dependent claims 2-8 include all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 1. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claims 2-8 are allowable over *DeHon* in view of *Mirsky* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 1 being allowable over *DeHon* in view of *Mirsky*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claims 2-8 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *DeHon* in view of *Mirsky* is therefore respectfully requested.

Claim 10 depends from independent claim 9. Therefore, dependent claim 10 includes all of the elements and limitations of independent claim 9. It is therefore respectfully submitted by the Applicant that dependent claim 10 is allowable over *DeHon* in view of *Mirsky* for at least the same reason as set forth herein with respect to independent claim 9 being allowable over *DeHon* in view of *Mirsky*. Withdrawal of the rejection of dependent claim 10 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *DeHon* in view of *Mirsky* is therefore respectfully requested.

June 19, 2007
Atty. Docket No.: NL02 0444 US (79002-2)
Serial No.: 10/516,626
Filed: November 30, 2004
Page 8 of 8

SUMMARY

The Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-10 fully satisfy the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §§102, 103 and 112. In view of the foregoing, favorable consideration and early passage to issue of the present application is respectfully requested. If any points remain in issue that may best be resolved through a personal or telephonic interview, Examiner Geib is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned at the telephone number listed below.

Dated: June 19, 2007

Respectfully submitted,
B. DE OLIVEIRA KASTRUP PEREIRA

PHILIPS INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY
& STANDARDS
P.O. Box 3001
Briarcliff Manor, New York 10510

Paul Im
Registration No. 50,418
Attorney for Applicant



WOODARD, EMHARDT, MORIARITY,
MCNETT, AND HENRY, LLC.
111 Monument Circle, Suite 3700
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-5137

Darrin Wesley Harris
Registration No. 40,636
Attorney for Applicant